

S. 1872

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1872, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Army Rangers Veterans of World War II in recognition of their extraordinary service during World War II.

S. 1894

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1894, a bill to designate Regional Ocean Partnerships of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 1904

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1904, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to foreign support for Palestinian terrorism, and for other purposes.

S. 1909

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1909, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reform requirements with respect to direct and indirect remuneration under Medicare part D, and for other purposes.

S. 1921

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1921, a bill to establish the National Institutes of Clean Energy.

S. 1945

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) were added as cosponsors of S. 1945, a bill to provide for the long-term improvement of Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and for other purposes.

S. 1978

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1978, a bill to prohibit the use of funds for the 2026 World Cup unless the United States Soccer Federation provides equitable pay to the members of the United States Women's National Team and the United States Men's National Team.

S. 2000

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2000, a bill to promote the United States-Greece defense partnership, and for other purposes.

S. 2032

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE), the Senator from

South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN), the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2032, a bill to extend and modify the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa Program, to postpone the medical exam for aliens who are otherwise eligible for such program, to provide special immigrant status for certain surviving spouses and children, and for other purposes.

S. 2048

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2048, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 2068

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2068, a bill to require the Minority Business Development Agency of the Department of Commerce to promote and administer programs in the public and private sectors to assist the development of minority business enterprises, to ensure that such Agency has the necessary supporting resources, particularly during economic downturns, and for other purposes.

S. 2084

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of Florida, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2084, a bill to terminate the order requiring persons to wear masks while on conveyances and at transportation hubs.

S. 2109

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2109, a bill to prohibit allocations of Special Drawing Rights at the International Monetary Fund for perpetrators of genocide and state sponsors of terrorism without congressional authorization.

S. 2169

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2169, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect more victims of domestic violence by preventing their abusers from possessing or receiving firearms, to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to establish a grant program relating to the removal of firearms from adjudicated domestic violence offenders, and for other purposes.

S. 2177

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from New Mexico

(Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2177, a bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to ensure sufficient bonding and complete and timely reclamation of land and water disturbed by Federal and Indian oil and gas production, and for other purposes.

S. 2193

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2193, a bill to ensure that an employment relationship is not established between a franchisor and a franchisee if the franchisor engages in certain activities, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 212

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 212, a resolution establishing a McCain-Mansfield Fellowship Program in the Senate.

S. RES. 275

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 275, a resolution acknowledging and apologizing for the mistreatment of, and discrimination against, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals who served the United States in the Armed Forces, the Foreign Service, and the Federal civil service.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. SINEMA, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 2204. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to clarify the mailing requirement relating to social security account statements; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WYDEN. Madame President, Senator CASSIDY and I are reintroducing a simple bill that can have a big impact: the Know Your Social Security Act. The bill clarifies the law about Congressional intent so that every worker over 25 receives a paper Social Security statement in the mail each year, unless the worker has accessed their statement online or declined to receive the statement in the mail.

The story is well known in Social Security circles, but it bears repeating: the origin story of the Social Security statement all started with the "powerful" Committee on Finance. Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan spelled out the reasoning: "All of us pay into Social Security but rarely, until we become beneficiaries, do we ever hear from Social Security . . . in every paycheck, we see money withheld for Social Security, but we hear nary a word from the Social Security Administration. Let us take this simple step [sending statements] to reassure Americans that Social Security will be there for them."

After enactment and once fully phased in, every worker aged 25 and

older received an annual statement from Social Security starting in the year 2000. After a few years, Social Security's website allowed workers to access their statement online. At the time, that was a nice feature—and did not impact the mailing of statements. Later—to fund more pressing needs—SSA viewed the online option as “providing” the worker with a statement and fulfilling the requirements of the law. SSA stopped mailing the statements in 2011 to everyone over 25. Currently, only individuals over the age of 60 who are not receiving benefits receive statements automatically through the mail.

Paper statements delivered through the mail are desirable because no action is necessary by the worker and the statement is a yearly reminder to the worker to think about the future. Research has shown that workers provided with statements are significantly more likely to save, more certain about their retirement income, and have higher satisfaction with their finances relative to those who are not provided with any type of financial planning materials. Providing Social Security statement through the mail is a simple policy that could help many workers, hopefully leading to better decisions about their financial future.

Ways and Means Social Security Subcommittee Chairman JOHN LARSON and Ways and Means Committee Member VERN BUCHANAN are reintroducing the companion bill in the House of Representatives. The bill is endorsed by AARP, Alliance for Retired Americans, Envelope Manufacturers Association (EMA), Justice in Aging, NAACP, National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, Paralyzed Veterans of America, Social Security Works, Strengthen Social Security Coalition, The Arc of the United States, and The Senior Citizens League. I hope our colleagues in the Senate will join us and cosponsor the Know Your Social Security Act. Together, we can work towards better retirement outcomes for all workers.

By Mr. THUNE:

S. 2207. A bill to temporarily increase the availability of temporary non-immigrant nonagricultural workers for the purposes of restoring American forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2207

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXEMPTION FROM H-2B NUMERICAL LIMITATION FOR CERTAIN FORESTRY CONSERVATION WORKERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 214(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(g)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(12)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the numerical limitation under paragraph (1)(B) shall not apply to principal aliens described in section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii)(b) who are employed or have received an offer of employment for the work of—

- “(i) orchard work and seed collection;
 - “(ii) tree planting;
 - “(iii) nursery care;
 - “(iv) forest management;
 - “(v) harvesting pine straw or other minor forest products;
 - “(vi) timber stand improvement;
 - “(vii) herbicide application;
 - “(viii) fire prevention and fire management activities;
 - “(ix) brush clearing and vegetation management;
 - “(x) maintenance of right of ways;
 - “(xi) habitat protection and restoration;
 - “(xii) watershed protection and restoration;
 - “(xiii) land reclamation; or
 - “(xiv) other activities with a direct forest health or conservation nexus.
- “(B) The exemptions described in subparagraph (A) shall not apply to landscaping or groundskeeping.”.

(b) SUNSET.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall remain in effect until the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. KELLY):

S. 2223. A bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to improve assistance to community wood facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Ms. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Community Wood Facilities Assistance Act of 2021. My colleagues Senators COLLINS, SHAHEEN, and KELLY are joining me as original cosponsors of the bill.

This bill will assist with the construction of facilities for mass timber, tall wood, and other innovative wood products, in order to make sustainable use of small-diameter timber from forest thinning and other needed treatments in Eastern and Western forests.

The bill will also help to create jobs in disadvantaged rural and forest-dependent communities, and will help to reduce wildfire risk by removing dangerous fuels that can build up.

The Forest Service reports that 80 million acres of Forest Service lands alone are at risk of catastrophic wildfire or abnormal levels of insect and disease infestations.

While Federal land management agencies are working to increase the pace and scale of restoration activities, clearly we need to do more. In California we are facing a severe drought, and even before the onset of this most recent drought there were 150 million dead or dying trees due to insect damage. We are truly facing a monumental challenge.

A recent comprehensive analysis by The Nature Conservancy and Bain and Company management consultants found that creating a restoration economy can play an important role in expanding the pace and scale of ecologically based forest restoration. The

report recommended funding and incentives to “bridge the gap between the cost of ecological thinning and the economic viability of wood-processing infrastructure.”

As the report explains, “If more aggressive restoration targets can be met, there will be significant need for additional processing capacity to defray restoration costs and provide valuable end uses for thinned material.”

Our bill responds to the challenge of developing funding measures to improve the economic viability of wood-processing infrastructure to reduce the cost of forest restoration and provide valuable uses for the small diameter material.

Fortunately, we do not need to create a whole new program to improve the economic viability of wood-processing infrastructure. The Forest Service has two existing grant programs that can help: the Community Wood Energy and Wood Innovations Grant Program and the Wood Innovations Program.

These programs would benefit from amendments to increase their utility for improving the viability of wood-processing infrastructure. In particular, the program could benefit from higher Federal cost-shares and an increased ability to provide more funding for each project, in addition to a higher authorization of funding overall.

More specifically, our bill will revise the Forest Service's Community Wood Energy and Wood Innovations Grant Program, which provides assistance to the capital cost of small wood products facilities. Specifically, our bill would:

Increase the authorization from \$25 million to \$50 million per year;

Increase the maximum grant per facility from \$1 to \$5 million;

Increase the Federal cost-share from 35% to 50%; and

Increase the maximum size for community wood energy systems eligible for grant funding from 5 to 15 megawatts, among other provisions.

Our bill will also revise the Forest Service's Wood Innovations Grant Program, which provides grants for proposed innovative uses and applications and the expansion of markets for wood products. Our bill would reduce the minimum non-Federal cost-share from 50% to 33.3% and makes other technical changes identified by the Forest Service.

I thank the Senators who have joined me in cosponsoring this bill, and I urge the full Senate to promptly take up this bill and pass it as soon as possible.

By Mr. Kaine (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2244. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for teacher and school leader quality enhancement and to enhance institutional aid; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, as career opportunities and the requisite skills

for success adapt to the demands of the 21st century, so too must the instruction and preparation educators receive. Educators are tasked with designing educational experiences that rise to the rigorous State academic standards and reflect the needs and interests of our Nation's diverse student population. This past school year with the pandemic was even more demanding on our Nation's educators as they were faced with new teaching challenges and adapting to virtual or hybrid learning environments. Prior to the pandemic, school districts were faced with widespread teacher shortages, with nearly every State reporting shortages of teachers in high-need subjects like math, science, and special education. Data from the U.S. Department of Education shows COVID-19 has only exacerbated those needs with 43 States reporting shortages in math teachers, 42 in science teachers, and 44 in special education for the 2020-21 school year.

We must find ways to strengthen the educator talent pipeline to ensure our students have access to high-quality educators and school leaders. We also must address the fact that schools in high-need communities are often staffed by a revolving door of underprepared and inexperienced teachers who unable to meet students' needs. According to the U.S. Department of Education's Civil Rights Data Collection, in 2016, schools with high enrollments of students of color were four times as likely to hire uncertified teachers as were schools with low enrollments of students of color. This in part due to State teacher shortages.

This is why I am pleased to introduce today with my colleague, Senator COLLINS, the Preparing and Retaining Education Professionals Act, or PREP Act. As schools across our Nation continue to face growing class sizes, many are struggling with a shortage of qualified teachers. Rural communities in particular are experiencing a dearth of teachers equipped to meet their growing needs. The PREP Act aims to create high-quality teacher residency programs to develop a diverse workforce that is well prepared to provide the educational opportunities students need to be successful in the 21st century.

More specifically, this legislation would expand the definition of "high need" districts under the Every Student Succeeds Act, ESSA, to include those experiencing teacher shortages in rural communities and in areas such as special education, English language, science, technology, engineering, math, and CTE, to allow for access to additional support and improvement. It would also encourage school districts to establish partnerships with local community colleges and universities to ensure their education programs are developing future teachers in content areas where there is currently a shortage of educators. It would increase access to teacher and school leader residency programs and preparation train-

ing while requiring States to identify areas of teacher or leader shortages by subject across public schools and use that data to target their efforts. Additionally, the PREP Act bolsters support for teacher preparation programs at minority serving institutions, MSIs, or historically Black colleges and universities, HBCUs, to invest in a diverse and well-prepared educator workforce.

Improving our Nation's educational system is contingent on our ability to prepare, support, and retain quality educators. Research shows that better prepared teachers stay longer in the profession and are more likely to remain in their roles and positively impact young people and their communities. As we continue to focus on recovering from the pandemic, I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle see the PREP Act as a common-sense opportunity to help ensure that students in every ZIP Code across the country have the well-prepared teachers and school leaders they deserve.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 2255. A bill to extend the trade adjustment assistance program for one month; considered and passed.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, one week from today, on July 1st, Trade Adjustment Assistance will expire.

This is our only tool to support workers who lose their jobs because of countries like China that cheat the rules. And in one week, it goes away. This is an economic problem and a China problem.

All of us, of both parties, recognize the threat that countries like China pose to our economy. It's why just two weeks ago, we came together and passed the Endless Frontiers Act on a broad, bipartisan basis: To secure and expand our domestic supply chains, to support R&D to ensure the next generation of manufacturing is developed in America and made in America, and to finally—finally—ensure that Americans' tax dollars are used to buy American products that support American jobs.

This should not be controversial.

We are working to undo decades of bad trade policy with China, and decades of neglect for our domestic supply chains. That's going to take years. We know corporations won't stop outsourcing jobs on July 1st. We know China isn't going to stop cheating and undermining American industries on July 1st. And we know our manufacturers will still have to compete against governments that prop up their competitors on July 1st.

We owe it to workers, who we know are going to have their lives upended through no fault of their own to unfair trade, to do everything we can to ease the transition. Today, I'm not asking for a complete renewal of the program. I'm not even asking for an extra year of the program.

I, on behalf of my Democratic colleagues and American workers, asked for unanimous consent from this body

for a straight 3-month extension of TAA, so that we can keep having the conversations about how best to structure the program going forward. It appears that my friends on the other side would prefer a 1-month extension. I would like more, but in the spirit of compromise—this beats the alternative—letting TAA expire and leaving workers in the lurch.

And while that dialogue continues, workers get the help they need.

We know workers are losing jobs to China all over the country. Sadly, that happens every week, every day.

By extending this program, service workers and people whose jobs get shipped overseas to countries without trade agreements will get help.

Training funds, will continue being provided, at a time when we need to train people for the new jobs that we want industry to create. We all want the US economy to be more resilient in the face of economic shocks. We all want to see fewer communities devastated by unfair trade. We all want American workers' hard work to pay off TAA is part of that.

We came together to extend it in 2011. We came together to extend it in 2015. We must do the same today.

If you love this country you fight for the people who make it work. That's what we do with Trade Adjustment Assistance.

S. 2255

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Trade Adjustment Assistance Extension Act of 2021".

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) EXTENSION OF TERMINATION PROVISIONS.—Section 285 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2271 note) is amended by striking "June 30, 2021" each place it appears and inserting "July 23, 2021".

(b) REEMPLOYMENT TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE.—Section 246(b)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2318(b)(1)) is amended by striking "June 30, 2021" and inserting "July 23, 2021".

(c) TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR WORKERS.—Section 245(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2317(a)) is amended by striking "June 30, 2021" and inserting "July 23, 2021".

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section take effect on the earlier of—

(1) the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(2) June 30, 2021.

(e) APPLICATION OF PRIOR LAW.—Section 406 of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Reauthorization Act of 2015 (title IV of Public Law 114-27; 129 Stat. 379; 19 U.S.C. 2271 note prec.) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "July 1, 2021" and inserting "July 24, 2021"; and

(B) in paragraphs (5) and (6), by striking "the 1-year period beginning on July 1, 2021" and inserting "the period beginning on July 24, 2021, and ending on June 30, 2022"; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking "July 1, 2021" each place it appears and inserting "July 24, 2021".

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself,
Ms. STABENOW, Mr. DURBIN, Mr.

BOOKER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 2272. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to increase funding for lead reduction projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the “Lead-Free Drinking Water for All Act.” This legislation would authorize \$45 billion to replace every lead pipe and service line in America over the next 10 years, ensuring clean water for all.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the most common sources of lead in drinking water are lead pipes, faucets, and plumbing fixtures. Nationwide, there are 6 to 10 million lead service lines serving up to 22 million Americans, affecting Americans living in all 50 states, Washington, D.C., and Puerto Rico. The only way to guarantee lead-free drinking water is to remove and replace every lead pipe and service line in America—and that’s precisely what this legislation calls for.

The Lead-Free Drinking Water for All Act would reauthorize EPA’s lead reduction projects grant program and increase the authorization to \$4.5 billion per year for 10 years. It would prioritize disadvantaged communities and set a ten-year deadline for projects to complete the lead service line removal. It would also guarantee that funded projects pay a prevailing wage.

Epidemiologic studies have consistently demonstrated that there is no safe level of exposure to lead. According to the EPA, lead is particularly harmful for young children: low levels of exposure have been linked to damage to the central and peripheral nervous system, learning disabilities, impaired hearing, impaired physical development, and impaired formation and function of blood cells. EPA has set the maximum contaminant level goal for lead in drinking water at zero because lead can be harmful to human health, even at low exposure levels.

This problem is particularly prevalent in California’s Central Valley, where, for example, in 2017 approximately 25 percent of schools in Fresno County reported lead in their drinking water while statewide, almost 1 in 5 kids attended a school that served drinking water with lead contamination.

The Lead-Free Drinking Water for All Act would protect public health by guaranteeing that all Americans have access to lead-free drinking water. By providing funding for grants and prioritizing disadvantaged communities, this legislation would also reduce disparities in access to clean water and ensure that the burden of paying for lead service line replacement does not fall on disadvantaged communities.

I thank my co-lead, Senator STABENOW, for her tireless leadership fighting for clean water for her constituents in

Michigan and all Americans. I also thank the cosponsors of this bill for championing this vital effort with us in the Senate.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to enact the “Lead-Free Drinking Water for All Act” as quickly as possible.

Thank you, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. KING):

S. 2304. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to require that direct-to-consumer advertisements for prescription drugs and biological products include an appropriate disclosure of pricing information; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2304

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Drug-Price Transparency for Competition Act of 2021” or the “DTC Act of 2021”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; SENSE OF THE SENATE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Direct-to-consumer advertising of prescription pharmaceuticals is legally permitted in only 2 developed countries, the United States and New Zealand.

(2) In 2018, pharmaceutical ad spending exceeded \$6,046,000,000, a 4.8 percent increase over 2017, resulting in the average American seeing 9 drug advertisements per day.

(3) The most commonly advertised medication in the United States has a list price of more than \$6,000 for a one-month’s supply.

(4) A 2021 Government Accountability Office report found that two-thirds of all direct-to-consumer drug advertising between 2016 and 2018 was concentrated among 39 brand-name drugs or biological products, about half of which were recently approved by the Food and Drug Administration.

(5) According to a 2011 Congressional Budget Office report, pharmaceutical manufacturers advertise their products directly to consumers in an attempt to boost demand for their products and thereby raise the price that consumers are willing to pay, increase the quantity of drugs sold, or achieve some combination of the two.

(6) Studies, including a 2012 systematic review published in the Annual Review of Public Health, a 2005 randomized trial published in the Journal of the American Medical Association, and a 2004 survey published in Health Affairs, show that patients are more likely to ask their doctor for a specific medication and for the doctor to write a prescription for it, if a patient has seen an advertisement for such medication, even if such medication is not the most clinically appropriate for the patient or if a lower-cost generic medication may be available.

(7) According to a 2011 Congressional Budget Office report, the average number of prescriptions written for newly approved brand-name drugs with direct-to-consumer advertising was 9 times greater than the average number of prescriptions written for newly approved brand-name drugs without direct-to-consumer advertising.

(8) The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services is the single largest drug payer in the United States. Between 2016 and 2018, 58 percent of the \$560,000,000,000 in Medicare drug spending was for advertised drugs, and in 2018 alone, the 20 most advertised drugs on television cost Medicare and Medicaid a combined \$34,000,000,000.

(9) A 2021 Government Accountability Office report found that direct-to-consumer advertising may have contributed to increases in Medicare beneficiary use and spending among certain drugs.

(10) The American Medical Association has passed resolutions supporting the requirement for price transparency in any direct-to-consumer advertising, stating that such advertisements on their own “inflate demand for new and more expensive drugs, even when these drugs may not be appropriate”.

(11) A 2019 study published in the Journal of the American Medical Association found that health care consumers dramatically underestimate their out-of-pocket costs for certain expensive medications, but once they learn the wholesale acquisition cost (in this section referred to as the “WAC”) of the product, they are far better able to approximate their out-of-pocket costs.

(12) Approximately half of Americans have high-deductible health plans, under which they often pay the list price of a drug until their insurance deductible is met. All of the top Medicare prescription drug plans use co-insurance rather than fixed-dollar copayments for medications on nonpreferred drug tiers, exposing beneficiaries to WAC prices.

(13) Section 119 of division CC of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (Public Law 116-260) requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to increase the use of real-time benefit tools to lower beneficiary costs. However, there still remains a lack of available pricing tools so patients may not learn of their medication’s cost until after being given a prescription for the medication. A 2013 study published in The Oncologist found that one-quarter of all cancer patients chose not to fill a prescription due to cost.

(14) The Federal Government already exercises its authority to oversee certain aspects of direct-to-consumer drug advertising, including required disclosures of information related to side effects, contraindications, and effectiveness.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) a lack of transparency in pricing for pharmaceuticals has led to a lack of competition for such pharmaceuticals, as evidenced by a finding by the Department of Health and Human Services that “Consumers of pharmaceuticals are currently missing information that consumers of other products can more readily access, namely the list price of the product, which acts as a point of comparison when judging the reasonableness of prices offered for potential substitute products” (84 Fed. Reg. 20735);

(2) in an age where price information is ubiquitous, the prices of pharmaceuticals remain shrouded in secrecy and limited to those who subscribe to expensive drug price reporting services, which typically include pharmaceutical manufacturers or other health care industry entities and not the general public;

(3) greater insight and transparency into drug prices will help consumers know if they can afford to complete a course of therapy before deciding to initiate that course of therapy;

(4) price shopping is the mark of rational economic behavior, and markets operate more efficiently when consumers have relevant information about a product, including

its price, before making an informed decision about whether to buy that product;

(5) providing consumers with basic price information may result in the selection of lesser cost alternatives, all else being equal relative to the patient's care, and is integral to providing adequate competition in the market;

(6) the WAC is a factual, objective, and uncontroversial definition for the list price of a medication, in that it is defined in statute, reflects an understood place in the supply chain, and is at the sole discretion of the manufacturer to set;

(7) there is a governmental interest in ensuring that consumers who seek to purchase pharmaceuticals for purposes of promoting their health and safety understand the objective list price of any pharmaceutical that they are encouraged through advertisements to purchase, which allows consumers to make informed purchasing decisions; and

(8) there is a governmental interest in mitigating wasteful expenditures and promoting the efficient administration of the Medicare program by slowing the growth of Federal spending on prescription drugs.

SEC. 3. REQUIREMENT THAT DIRECT-TO-CONSUMER ADVERTISEMENTS FOR PRESCRIPTION DRUGS AND BIOLOGICAL PRODUCTS INCLUDE AN APPROPRIATE DISCLOSURE OF PRICING INFORMATION.

Part A of title XI of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 1150D. REQUIREMENT THAT DIRECT-TO-CONSUMER ADVERTISEMENTS FOR PRESCRIPTION DRUGS AND BIOLOGICAL PRODUCTS INCLUDE AN APPROPRIATE DISCLOSURE OF PRICING INFORMATION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall require that each direct-to-consumer advertisement for a prescription drug or biological product for which payment is available under title XVIII or XIX includes an appropriate disclosure of pricing information with respect to the drug or product.

“(b) APPROPRIATE DISCLOSURE OF PRICING INFORMATION.—For the purposes of subsection (a), an appropriate disclosure of pricing information, with respect to a prescription drug or biological product—

“(1) shall include a disclosure of the wholesale acquisition cost (as defined in section 1847A(c)(6)(B)) for a 30-day supply of (or, if applicable, a typical course of treatment for) such drug or product;

“(2) shall be presented clearly and conspicuously, as appropriate for the medium of the advertisement; and

“(3) may include additional qualitative or quantitative information regarding the price of such drug or product explaining that certain patients may pay a different amount depending on their insurance coverage.

“(c) ENFORCEMENT.—Any person who violates the requirement of this section may be subject to a civil money penalty of not more than \$100,000 for each such violation or to another enforcement mechanism determined by the Secretary. Any civil money penalty shall be imposed and collected in the same manner as civil money penalties under subsection (a) of section 1128A are imposed and collected under that section.

“(d) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, shall promulgate regulations to carry out this section. Such regulations shall determine the components of the requirement under this section, including the forms of advertising, the manner of disclosure, the appropriate sanctions, and the appropriate disclosure of pricing information.”.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 284—RECOGNIZING THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDIANA VETERANS' HOME

Mr. BRAUN (for himself and Mr. YOUNG) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 284

Whereas Indiana has a proud tradition of honoring its veterans and those who serve our country;

Whereas 3 out of 4 Hoosiers of eligible age served in the Civil War;

Whereas 1 out of every 10 Union Army soldiers enlisted from Indiana, and only 1 State, Delaware, provided more soldiers in the Civil War based on per capita population than Indiana;

Whereas the Soldiers and Sailors Monument is located in the center of Indianapolis and the State of Indiana, and when it was dedicated in 1902, the only monument taller in the United States was the Washington Monument;

Whereas, in 1886, at the annual encampment of the Department of Indiana Grand Army of the Republic (“G.A.R.”) held in Indianapolis, Indiana, Department Commander David N. Foster urged the G.A.R. to establish a State soldiers' home in Indiana to care for the disabled Union Veteran Soldiers;

Whereas intensive lobbying by the G.A.R. resulted in the Indiana General Assembly of 1888 resolving to found a home for veterans, and in 1890, work toward the home began;

Whereas a committee was founded to find a suitable location for the home, with a member-at-large and 1 member from each congressional district, including James R. Carnahan (at large), W.H. Tucker, David N. Foster, C.J. Murphy, D.F. Spees, Andrew Fite, H.B. Martin, U.D. Cole, A.O. Marsh, C.M. Travis, W.S. Haggard, D.B. McConnell, Jacob J. Todd, and Jasper E. Lewis;

Whereas, in the summer of 1892, the committee decided to formally recommend 187 wooded acres in Lafayette, Indiana, as the location of the Indiana State Soldiers' Home (also known as the “Indiana Veterans' Home”) (referred to in this preamble as the “Home”);

Whereas the City of Lafayette and the County of Tippecanoe agreed to donate 200 acres of ground and \$5,633 for the Home;

Whereas General Richard P. DeHart, a local veteran and business man, donated a 2,000 foot strip of riverfront property, which is now known as the Tecumseh Trails Park, to the Home;

Whereas the committee, having secured a location, prepared a bill to be presented to the Indiana General Assembly for the establishment and maintenance of the Home;

Whereas, due to lack of time, the bill failed to pass the Indiana Senate, but in 1895, the Indiana General Assembly unanimously passed a bill to create the Home and appropriated \$75,000 for its buildings;

Whereas, on February 23, 1895, Governor Claude Matthews signed the bill, and it became law;

Whereas the Governor appointed 5 men as the first Board of Trustees of the Home to work without compensation other than their actual traveling expenses;

Whereas the Indiana General Assembly appropriated \$61,723.61 to be used in building an old men's home, a chapel, and an addition to the dining room, constructing sewers, furnishing the different buildings, graveling streets, roads, and sidewalks, and purchasing a pump, a dynamo, and a fire apparatus;

Whereas, by 1900, numerous buildings had been erected for the use of the residents of the Home, and the applications for residence at the Home were far greater than its facilities were capable of handling;

Whereas, on October 31, 1900, there were 9 State buildings, 39 county cottages, 5 cottages built by the G.A.R., 1 cottage built by the Woman's Relief Corps of Indiana (“W.R.C.”), 1 cottage each built by the John A. Logan and Marsh B. Taylor W.R.C. of Lafayette, and 1 cottage built by the John A. Logan Circle, Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic of Lafayette;

Whereas, in addition to these buildings, the Home built a public restaurant, Commandant's home, Surgeon's cottage, and combination carpenter and paint shop;

Whereas, in addition to the sums donated for the buildings, the W.R.C. and Ladies of the G.A.R. throughout the State gave \$1,326.25 to furnish rooms and cottages in the Home;

Whereas, in his written history of Tippecanoe County from 1909, General Richard P. DeHart wrote of the Home, “If one ever doubted that America appreciates and cares for her defenders, a visit to this beauty spot of Indiana will convince them that not only in times of peril and war does she care for her brave soldiery, but that now after forty years have come and gone, she still seeks to show these old and infirm men that she wishes them all the peace and comfort possible to provide for them, at any cost.”;

Whereas peak census was reached in the 1910s when the Home housed over 1,400 residents and another 200 staff members;

Whereas the Home operated as its own little town, complete with a hospital, electric light plant, bakery, fire department, and an assembly hall with a seating capacity for 600 people;

Whereas census in the 1920s had declined to the average number of residents numbering in the 1,000s;

Whereas this state of affairs continued, and, by 1950, it was apparent that the Home needed a major revamping;

Whereas this revamping resulted in the destruction of almost all of the original buildings, and today only 5 structures remain from the earlier years of the Home, including the Commandant's home, the Administration Building, the Lawrie Library, the bus station, and the cemetery chapel;

Whereas 9 acres of the Home's land were listed in National Register of Historic Places in 1974, including 4 original buildings—the Commandant's home, the library, the Administration Building, and the post exchange;

Whereas, in addition, a collection of approximately 165 oil portraits and charcoal drawings of Civil War generals and important political figures, painted by Captain Alexander Lawrie, are housed in the library and add a major cultural dimension to the Home;

Whereas, in 1974, the Home became a licensed healthcare facility;

Whereas, on June 4, 1976, the Home's name was officially changed from the Indiana State Soldiers' Home to the Indiana Veterans' Home, and the title of the chief administrator was changed from Commandant to Superintendent;

Whereas, in 1976, the construction of Ernie Pyle Hall, MacArthur Hall, and Mitchell Hall began and continued until completion in 1982;

Whereas, in 2009, the Commandant's Row buildings were placed under the authority of the Indiana Department of Veterans Affairs and the Home;

Whereas census has declined over the decades as Civil War veterans passed, but the Home has averaged 200 residents annually,